

Date: Sat, 23 Apr 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #181
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 23 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 181

Today's Topics:

"NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading (5 msgs)
/AA? (I'm confused) (3 msgs)
Another Vanity Call Question
LICENSING DELAYS
Problems with Abuse from Germans
Vanity Callsign Question
VE's license revoked???

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Apr 94 07:17:00 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply
>gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least
>not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case
>someone asked to see it.

>
>Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no
>indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will
>this change for future technicians?)

>
>So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter
>SSB?

Part 97. Not much else.

> Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody
>really care? ;-)

The FCC and a most hams, even a few "codeless tech's".

Dan N8PKV

--
The president [Clinton - Sworn Defender of the US Constitution] said he directed advisers to craft a policy allowing police to search public housing for weapons in the wake of a federal court order barring Chicago officials from conducting sweeps without search warrants.

-Source AP/Chicago Tribune 4/10/94

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 19:30:02 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!news.moneng.mei.com!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case someone asked to see it.

Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will this change for future technicians?)

So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody really care? ;-)

--
/`_- kevin.jessup@mixcom.com
{ }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc
\ / N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio
|__*| N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 21:57:31 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!
charnel.net.csuchico.edu!charnel!olivea!news.bu.edu!att-in!att-out!cbnews1!
rlt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply
>gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least
>not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case
>someone asked to see it.

Well, almost correct. We send the paperwork to the FCC; it's just that they don't send any back to you. :-)

>Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no
>indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will
>this change for future technicians?)

Not that I've heard. (Though there is now a "Tech plus HF" box on the ARRL CSCE's.)

>So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter
>SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody
>really care? ;-)

Actually, there's nothing to stop someone from operating anywhere beyond their privileges, except hopefully their own honesty and integrity. Most likely, no one would know. But there's always the possibility of someone listening in who has a vendetta against codeless techs or recent licensees in general, or anyone with a lower license class than s/he has, who could conceivably challenge him/her on the issue and (at the very least) make life miserable. If it turned out that the operator was, in fact, operating beyond his/her privileges, and someone complained to the FCC, they could decide to make an example of the violator. Whether, or to what degree, they would do so, I don't know. Personally, I wouldn't risk it. If I wanted HF that bad (which I did), I would just upgrade (which I did :-)).

73,
Roberta
AA2KZ

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 12:30:20 GMT
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter
>SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody
>really care? ;-)

FCC monitoring stations use a computerized database which lists license class for each issued callsign. Since they randomly check all bands, monitoring callsigns and checking against the database to see who's operating out of band, they may or may not catch you. In more cases than you'd imagine, someone who "knows" the ham operating in a prohibited segment tips off the local FCC office and they focus on catching him. It happens a lot - but - no doubt many violators aren't caught, especially if the operation is casual and random. Those who begin to believe they can do it anytime, with impunity, usually get caught sooner or later.

(|_|) * Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG * Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
| |) * Senior Systems Engineer * Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062

"You can have my bug when you can pry my cold, dead fingers from around it....." - anonymous radiotelegraph operator

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 13:49:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!
ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!hpa@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Followup to: <766915177snz@g8sjp.demon.co.uk>
By author: ip@g8sjp.demon.co.uk
In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>
> In article <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com>
> kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com "kevin jessup" writes:
>
> > So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter
> > SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody
> > really care? ;-)
>
> Same thing that prevents a Novice from operating on 10M SSB. You

> hear 'Novice'
> calls there all the time, right? As is being discussed in other threads
> elsewhere, you can no longer tell a license class by the format of the call.
>

Last I checked, Novices had privs for 10 m SSB.

/hpa

--
INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET: 181:294/101
rm -rf /msdos /windows /win-nt

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 16:59:14 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr20.090216.2244@hnrc.tufts.edu> jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu (Jerry Dallal) writes:

> I confuse easily. Would someone straighen me out about
> this?
>
> Suppose a technician upgrades to advanced. Part 97.9(b)
> says that advanced privileges can be used as long as the
> individual has a CSCE. 97.119(e) says that a modifier must
> be used after the call sign. In this case it would be /AA.
>
> My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a
> change of call signs. Does this mean that if N0NNN were to go
> from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in
> call sign, (s)he would be required to use N0NNN/AA while the
> upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old
> N0NNN once the new license was received!!!???

Yes. You can't tell the caste of an amateur by the format of his call, at least not after his paperwork clears the FCC. (Well you can if he changes calls during the upgrade, of course, but otherwise not.)

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary

534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 |

Date: 21 Apr 1994 14:37:00 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!jericho.mc.com!fugu!
levine@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2244@hnrc.tufts.edu, jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu (Jerry Dallal) writes:
--> I confuse easily. Would someone straighen me out about
--> this?

-->
--> Suppose a technician upgrades to advanced. Part 97.9(b)
--> says that advanced privileges can be used as long as the
--> individual has a CSCE. 97.119(e) says that a modifier must
--> be used after the call sign. In this case it would be /AA.

-->
--> My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a
--> change of call signs. Does this mean that if N0NNN were to go
--> from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in
--> call sign, (s)he would be required to use N0NNN/AA while the
--> upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old
--> N0NNN once the new license was received!!!???

-->
--> Thanks.

That is correct. This way pesky OOs will know that N0NNN who is listed in their database as a Technician has upgraded when they catch him operating on 20m.

However, once the license has arrived and N0NNN/AA starts using N0NNN, the pesky OOs will call because their Buckmaster CD ROM is now out of date!

Bob Levine KD1GG 7J1AIS VK2GYN formerly KA1JFP
levine@mc.com <-Internet email Phone(508) 256-1300 x247
kd1gg@wa1phy.ma <-Packet Mail FAX(508) 256-3599

Date: 21 Apr 1994 17:16:55 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!news.aero.org!sparky1.aero.org!

cantrell@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

OK, all of this suffixing got me thinking.

I have a call from 2-land but now live in 6-land.
Thus, when I work someone, I sign with WA2VXU/6.

Now, say I upgrade to General. How does one sign then?

WA2VXU/6/AG? WA2VXU/AG/6?

God, now I know why there is so much debate over CW! ;)

Yours,
cantrell

Date: 22 Apr 94 04:39:08 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Another Vanity Call Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Being happy with my call, and having a new box of QSLs on the shelf, I haven't followed the vanity proposal closely, but I do have one question: Will Novices, Techs, etc be able to get 1x2 and 2x1 calls? I know they will be behind other groups in being allowed to submit their requests, but is there anything in the proposal that limits the calls a given class may request?

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 17:10:05 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: LICENSING DELAYS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <supervisor.8.766759011@rose-hulman.edu> supervisor@rose-hulman.edu (EE DEPT NOVELL SUPERVISOR) writes:

>
>Remember how you felt when your license finally arrived? There were some
>very happy scouts yesterday evening.

Yeah, and just think, they wouldn't have been nearly as happy if it hadn't been for those long weeks of anticipation. If Christmas came every week, the thrill of anticipation would be gone.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244		

Date: Mon, 18 Apr 1994 15:29:58 EST
From: usc!math.ohio-state.edu!jussieu.fr!univ-lyon1.fr!swidir.switch.ch!
scsing.switch.ch!news.dfn.de!zeus.rbi.informatik.uni-frankfurt.de!terra.wiwi.uni-
frankfurt.de!news.th-darmstadt@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Problems with Abuse from Germans
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I post this here to outline the increasing problems that NON German Hams are receiving whilst liveing in Germany. I am my self receiveing this sort of mail on a daily basis.. I am infact a British Ham from GM land.

Its not the sort of mails that in 16 years of being a Ham that i like to see But since liveing in Germany for the past 4 years this is a common thing.I am not the only NON German ham that gets this sort of Abuse there are many others, But I am one that dont let this sort of Abuse get a hold.. So this user gets his abusive mail made Public.

Thanks.. GM8SAU/DC0HK

User-File: DC0HK

#	Call	Date	Hour	Bytes	Header
1	DL6QT	16.04.94	16:54	672	finally
2	DL6QT	17.04.94	07:52	847	promises

(DC0HK) DC0HK de DB0GV>r 1-

DC0HK @DB0GV de:DL6QT 16.04.94 16:54 UTC 672 Bytes
finally

940416/1653z DB0AIS, 940416/1510z DB0IZ , 940416/1454z DK0MWX
de DL6QT @ DK0MWX.#NRW.DEU.EU
to DC0HK @ DB0GV.#HES.DEU.EU

Barry..

I just read you News in ampr.os.linux of DB0RT!

I can say..I like to read this.

I hope you will do it and you will stop the traffic you create.

And what is with your travell to UK..

Don't you want to leave germany ???

I hope you will keep you promise.....! We are waiting!

Norbert...dl6qt

DC0HK @DB0GV de:DL6QT 17.04.94 07:52 UTC 847 Bytes
promises

940417/0744z DK0MTV, 940417/0740z DB0RBS

From: DL6QT @ DB0RBS.#BW.DEU.EU

To : DC0HK @ DB0GV.#HES.DEU.EU

And..

Today a friend told me..you occupied the complete digi
DB0ODW...!

WHEN...do you do you promises.

Stop TCPIP in Germany....go to UK...and...and...

Thats are all big speeches and nothing behind it.

I think its still better here than in your UK..isn't it!

Otherwise you would not stay here and bring all the nonsense
to amateur radio.

You know there are still regulation of amateur radio and this
regulations will stop your doing.

Please make us all happy.....keep your promises!

dl6qt, Norbert

Date: 21 Apr 1994 14:33:25 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!jericho.mc.com!
fugu!levine@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Vanity Callsign Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Has anyone seen or read anything in the vanity callsign proposal that would exclude people from requesting vanity calls from another district? I am in 1 land, but maybe I would like to have K00L for example?

Bob Levine KD1GG 7J1AIS VK2GYN formerly KA1JFP
levine@mc.com <-Internet email Phone(508) 256-1300 x247
kd1gg@wa1phy.ma <-Packet Mail FAX(508) 256-3599

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 17:07:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: VE's license revoked???
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2on7ds\$4is@bigfoot.wustl.edu> jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei)
writes:

>
>1) what can a ve do to get his license revoked?

Well aside from any of a lengthy list of NALs he could get because of illegal operating, the most likely cause for license revocation of a VE would be taking a bribe to falsify an exam. That's really bad news for you because it likely means that all applicants he passed will have to be retested.

>2) what can I do to get my license without waiting another month??? Does
> anybody have the addresses of the Texas senators, or representatives
> for precinct 1107 in Texas?
>
>3) can the ARRL do anything to find out what is *really* going on with my
> application??? This is *mighty* frustrating!!!

Neither can help. You are well and truly screwed if the VE's license was revoked for cheating. If his license was pulled for an operating violation, you may still be in luck after the investigation is complete. The best thing you can do is contact the VEC which sponsored the exam session and have them follow through for you. I'm afraid you're going to have

to retest though since the exam proctoring has been tainted.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244			

Date: 22 Apr 94 07:38:00 GMT

From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!
malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2p3egi\$cbp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>, <2p721j\$ktv\$1@rosebud.ncd.com>,
<2p7b72\$4rb@bigfoot.wustl.edu>ß
Subject : Re: Illinois anti scanner legislation

jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu (Jesse L Wei) writes:

>All the more reason to be an amateur, but the point is power of government
>vs. people's rights, not so much whether *we* can tote our toys. Can they
>really say that we cannot have things that can receive radio frequencies???
>I'm glad I live in Missouri and Texas, and not Illinois!!!

Sure they can. And it will cost you THOUSANDS of dollars IF you can prove
to a court that you are right! I never thought the US could degrade to
this point. It sickens me. We all need to become obnoxious to the 'elected
representatives' about all this stuff. They are power hungry and need a
reality check (Before they succede and WE need the reality check).

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #181
